

PRIMARY ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION 1

This is another general obligation bond measure. It asks voters permission for the State of California to borrow more money by selling "bonds" that would need to be repaid with interest (*potentially through higher property taxes*) usually over many decades.

I say "*potentially*" because sometimes bond proceeds are used for financing but repaid by program recipients - such as homeowners under the former Cal-Vet home-farm loan program.

Bond measures present several questions:

1. How far in debt is the government already?
2. What is the expected total cost of the measure to the public?
3. Are the proposed uses for the money specified?
4. Are the proposed uses justified - given other things that may be needed or desired?
5. Should voters continue to finance projects through higher property taxes when California's property tax system is so unfair?

CALIFORNIA'S PROPERTY TAX SYSTEM IS UNFAIR

In 1978, California voters approved a voter initiative then-known as Proposition 13. The initiative added provisions to the California Constitution that prevented the "*re-assessment*" of real property unless and until the property changes hands or is substantially rebuilt.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION 1

SUBJECT TO COURT
ORDERED CHANGES

PRIMARY ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION 1 (page 2)

Proposition 13 has protected real property owners from steep tax increases based on higher property values; however, it has also created a system in which new homeowners pay 10-20 times more than their neighbors whose property has like value but was obtained long ago.

In addition, because business property can be and is often leased (instead of sold), Proposition 13 has led to a massive shift of the overall property tax burden from businesses to homeowners.

The proponents of a ballot measure should bear the burden of explaining why it is worthy of support - given the full cost, available alternatives and other needs and wants.

In this case, the proponents should use their REBUTTAL to answer questions 1-5 above.

Gary Wesley

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION 1